

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 through 23 are in this application and are presented for consideration. Claims 1, 7, 10 and 14 have been amended, and new claims 16 through 23 have been added.

The specification, drawings and claims have been amended to address the Examiner's objections, incorporate the Examiner's suggestions and to place the application in better form.

The claims have also been amended to further highlight and more clearly point out the important features of the invention. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful reading of this application, for pointing out discrepancies, and for providing suggestions.

The original independent claims have been rejected as being anticipated by Young (US 5,134,550).

New independent claim 16 has been added to set forth first and second optical elements, where one of these optical elements converges the light rays to a point, and then diverges the light rays after the point. In the embodiment of figure 1, both of the optical elements 5 and 2 converge the light rays to a point, and then cause the light rays to diverge. In the embodiment of figure 4, the optical element 9 is shown converging and diverging light rays. The specification has been amended to describe these portions of figure 1. The drawings have also been amended to apply reference numerals 15 and 17 to the points where the light rays converge into and then diverge from.

Applicant has reviewed 550, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of optical elements which converge the light rays to a point, and then have the light rays diverge after that point.

Instead it appears that 550 leads a person to have all the light rays either extend in parallel as they pass through the light pole, or to be reflected several times by the inside of the light pole. Applicant notes that in the top portion of figure 1 of 550, it appears that any light rays travel in parallel through the inside 56. Meanwhile, the specification indicates that the inside of the pole 12 is to be highly reflective, column 2 lines 44 through 47. This indicates that light rays are to be reflected many times in a ricochet effect. Applicant finds no teaching in 550 of converging the light rays to a point, and then diverge in the light rays after the point. Therefore new independent claim 16 cannot be anticipated by 550.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to set forth that one of the optical functions converges substantially all of the light received from the light source into a point and then diverges the light after the point. As described above, this is not taught in 550, and 550 leads a person to either have light rays extend in parallel, or to have the light rays be reflected several times by the highly reflective interior of the light pole in 550.

New claim 18 sets forth that it is the second optical element which converges the light rays to a point and then diverges a light rays after the point to illuminate the desired area. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion in 550 of a second optical element converging and then diverging light rays. Therefore claim 18 further defines over 550.

New claim 20 sets forth that the first optical elements converges substantially all of the light rays received from the light source to a point. Claim 20 then sets forth that substantially all of the light rays which diverge after the point intercept the second optical element. This is shown in the present figure 1. All of the light rays that diverge from point 15 are intercepted

by optical element 2. Applicant has found this combination to be particularly efficient. Applicant has reviewed 550, and finds no teaching nor suggestion of any rays that converge to a point then diverge, and are all intercepted by a second optical element. Claim 20 therefore further defines over 550.

New claims 21 and 22 set forth a tubular stand where the light source and the first optical element transmit substantially all of the light rays through a tubular stand without contacting the tubular stand. This is in direct contrast to 550, which specifically teaches light rays being reflected off an inside of a light pole. Claims 21 and 22 therefore further define over the prior art.

Claims 7, 9 and new claim 23 set forth that the tubular stand or tubular holder include transmitting or transparent material. The rejection appears to use the highly reflective coating of 550 to anticipate this transmitting or transparent material. Applicant notes that transparent or transmitting material allow light to penetrate and pass through, while highly reflective coatings, do not allow penetration of light, but instead reflect light. Therefore the highly reflective coating of 550 is certainly not a transmitting or transparent material, and is instead almost the exact opposite type of material. Claims 7, 9 and 23 therefore further define over 550.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based

on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Favorable action on the merits of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,



By: _____
Theobald Dengler
Registration No. 34,575
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:tf
71821-6

Attached: (1) Replacement Sheet of Drawings
Petition for Three Month Extension of Time

DATED: March 26, 2007
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-
0410.